St. Charles Seminary Library
Carthagena, Ohio
APR 18 '59

An Exchange of Views
—Letters and Replies

THE

Commonweal

On Catholic Education

What Is Its Goal?

by Aelred Graham

Formosa of the Middle East

Jordan's Chances for Survival

by Don Peretz

MANKIND ON THE MARCH . . . . . by Francis E. McMahon
ONE MAN'S VISION . . . . . by Richard V. Carpenter
PORTRAIT OF EVELYN WAUGH . . . . . by Edwin Kennebeck
MEETING: A POEM . . . . . by John Christopher

olume LXX, No. 4 April 24, 1959 Twenty-Five Cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Outlook

"The Commonweal is in some ways pessimistic. It disbelieves in the probability of a perfect political order, laws, governments, or human institutions. It views with alarm those prophets who promise a straight road to utopia. It believes that man's constant struggle is to hold his own, to keep his society from reverting to barbarism. It sees Original Sin as the first fact to be dealt with in human experience.

"The Commonweal is in other ways optimistic. It thinks that human society, though it can never be perfect, can, through constant effort, be made decent and kept civilized. It believes that history is non-determined, that man is not 'fated' to accomplish his own destruction, that through trial and error, through reason and learning, through suffering when need be, man can find a *modus vivendi*. It looks to the Resurrection of the Dead on the final day of the human race.

"Here and now, therefore, with Original Sin at his start and resurrection from the dead at his end, man must deal with his tractable, unpredictable, forever imperfect present. . . . He must take the lessons he has learned from any source—from Revelation, from history, from experience—and use them to form the basis for a habitable society."

(from the 30th Anniversary Issue)

FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS ONLY

THE COMMONWEAL, 386 Fourth Ave.
New York 16, N. Y.

Enclosed is $2.00. Send your trial offer of 13 issues to:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE..... STATE.....

4-24-59

THIS WEEK

Week by Week 91

On Catholic Education
by Aelred Graham 95

Formosa of the Middle East
by Don Peretz 98

Meeting: A Poem
by John Christopher 100

A Word for Tolerance
by John Cogley 101

The Screen
by Philip T. Hartung 102

The Stage
by Richard Hayes 102

An Exchange of Views
I—Socialism in Europe 103
II—The Meaning of Racism 105
III—Literature and Morality 106

Books 108

THE COMMONWEAL
386 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 16

Editor
EDWARD S. SKILLIN

Managing Editor
JAMES O'GARA

Associate Editors
JAMES FINN
RICHARD HORCHLER

Drama Critic: RICHARD HAYES; *Movie Critic:* PHILIP T. HARTUNG; *Social Action:* JOHN C. CORT; *Paris:* ROBERT BARRAT; *Rome:* GUNNAR D. KUMLIEN; *Great Britain:* MICHAEL P. FOGARTY

JOHN BRUBAKER: *Advertising Manager*

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Orange, Conn., under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the U.S.A. and published weekly at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. by the Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N.Y. MUrray Hill 3-9685.

Copyright © 1959 The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc.

U. S. and Canada, $8 a year. Foreign, $10. Single copies 25¢

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
Commonweal
A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature, and the Arts
THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

week by week

WESTERN DISAGREEMENT

DR. ADENAUER'S sudden decision to step down from the Chancellorship of the West German Federal Republic set off a world reaction of mingled amazement, alarm and gratification. Only a few days before he announced that he would relinquish his post as Chancellor for what has been up to now the largely honorary post of President, the "Old Man" had shown himself to be as firmly convinced as ever of the rightness of his "inflexible" position regarding East Germany and East-West negotiations, and as determined as ever to see his views prevail.

The immovability of the eighty-three-year-old German leader had been underlined particularly by his remarkably outspoken attack on British proposals for greater "flexibility" in meeting the Berlin crisis and on the entire "atmosphere" in Britain, which, he charged, was "anti-German." Dr. Adenauer's speech exposed the seriousness of the dispute among the Western allies on how best to deal with Russia in the impending negotiations, and the bitterness of his words made the prospects of an Anglo-German reconciliation seem slight indeed.

Against this background, the news that Dr. Adenauer had consented to accept his party's nomination for the Presidency was doubly dramatic. Not only did it suggest that he was at long last surrendering the political power he had always so jealously guarded, but it seemed to point toward a relaxation in the Adenauer "hard" German line against recognition of East Germany, against any alteration in the status of Berlin, against arms limitation or "disengagement" in Central Europe. This latter possibility, with the hope it raises of resolving the policy differences which weaken the West's position toward the Soviet Union, is, of course, of immediate importance to the whole Western world.

It is true that Dr. Adenauer has made clear his determination to see his foreign policy views maintained by his successor as Chancellor. Indeed, he explained his decision to accept the Presidency as intended precisely "to insure the continuity of our policy for years to come." He cited the constitutional powers of the President to nominate the Chancellor and to "represent" the nation "in its international relations." Although in his own Chancellorship the office of President has been of negligible importance, like the corresponding office in the Fourth, pre-de Gaulle, French Republic, Dr. Adenauer said that the importance of this post has been "underestimated." His obvious intention is to widen the scope of the Presidency to something like the office of power held by de Gaulle.

IT SEEMS UNLIKELY, however, that Dr. Adenauer will be able to have his way completely. Many West Germans, including some of his own Christian Democrats as well as the Social Democrats who have so long opposed him, are already lining up to prevent his proposed enlargement of the office of President, a step they say would be unconstitutional. Furthermore, future Chancellors will not necessarily be as pliant as he might like. A Chancellor who viewed his office as Dr. Adenauer himself did, it would seem, could effectively block the assumption of power by the President.

Despite Chancellor Adenauer's determination, therefore, it seems inevitable that his power to direct West German policy will be significantly diminished, that the considerable sentiment in his country for a less intransigent position will make itself more heavily felt on a less awe-inspiring-successor, that the pressure of the other NATO countries will bring about some modification in the presently "immovable" West German position.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But what will this mean in short-range terms, as regards the proposals the Western allies will bring to the fast-approaching May 11 foreign ministers' conference? Some of the bitterness may have been removed from the Macmillan-Adenauer dispute, and it may have become easier for Britain and West Germany to compromise in their approach to the East-West negotiations. Thus the chances for acceptance by the allies of the United States' "middle position" of cautious exploration seem much improved.

This is all to the good, and we can be grateful that the bickering and dissension among the allies seem to be diminished, that our differences seem not utterly irreconcilable. But merely this is small comfort indeed. A reluctantly arrived at "compromise package," which is all the West seems likely to muster, seems far from the best equipment for a horse-trading conference with the U.S.S.R. We may be sure that the Soviets are ready to exploit whatever weakness and disunity they may find. And, in the absence of the strong U.S. leadership which might have filled the policy-vacuum, the Western nations approach the bargaining table in a discouraging state of diplomatic confusion.

POLITICS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

THE DEBATE over unemployment grows hotter, and more partisan, by the minute. There are, we gather, many who deplore this fact, who think it would be ideal if only Americans of both parties would put aside their political differences in discussing the jobless. Here, they argue, is a national problem of vital concern to all of us; in considering it, politics should be put aside. But this abdication from politics is too much to hope for—indeed, even to wish that this issue could be kept "out of politics" is utopian.

On this specific question, perhaps more than on any other, the domestic philosophies of our two major political parties are not in agreement but in sharp conflict—at least today; if the situation were to get drastically worse, there might well be substantial agreement between the two parties on the need for emergency measures. But right now disagreement and division on this question represent the reality of American life, for the Republicans are convinced that expanded Federal action would do more harm than good and the Democrats say unemployment must be dealt with, budget or no. Some improvement in the level of the debate could be achieved, however, if both sides would recognize in public what they must admit in private. This is the fact that dealing with the present problem of unemployment, and with related questions of profit levels, inflation and automation, is a tricky business on which men with the best will in the world, including economists, can and do disagree.

We ourselves are convinced that the Administration should have taken more positive action months ago, concentrating on measures to boost the economy in particularly hard-hit areas while at the same time liberalizing and expanding unemployment compensation. Nonetheless, we recognize, as everyone surely must, that the Administration's refusal to take such action is based on Republican principle and on the conviction that its own methods are better for the country, at least in the long run. Therefore while debate on the subject should certainly continue, we see no point at all in much that is currently being said in that debate.

What value is there in speeches by Democrats and labor leaders which seem to imply that Administration officials simply do not care about unemployment? Conversely, what is the point of Republican statements which give the impression that the Democrats want only to bankrupt the country? Such examples could be multiplied, and they are all equally pointless. The nation has heard quite enough nonsense on the problem of unemployment, and the fact that the nonsense has been bipartisan does not help matters very much.

THE MERCURY ASTRONAUTS

STARTLING NEW developments in man's exploration of the far reaches of the universe hit the front page with such frequency these days that a conscientious newspaper-reader has great difficulty keeping up with them—even on a superficial basis. There is something undeniably bewildering about the odd chunks of knowledge regarding the hitherto inaccessible heavens being brought in piecemeal fashion before the world. For a person who is not particularly science-trained or science-minded, the new vision of the universe that now opens out, thanks to space-probers here and overseas, is anything but crystal-clear.

The announcement, therefore, of the selection of the seven "Mercury Astronauts" by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration serves as a good occasion for recapitulating our present capabilities and immediate prospects for space flight. The men chosen from over a hundred qualified

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aspirants are all experienced test pilots with engineering backgrounds. They have recently been through the most extensive and grueling tests, which simulated the conditions to be contended with in orbiting far above the earth. These seven test pilots are stable adults of better than average intelligence quite aware of the great hazards they face. They know that many factors in the first flight scheduled for two years hence are dependent on mechanisms and materials that are as yet far from perfected. Yet newsmen were struck with their eagerness to make the attempt, their unwavering confidence that all would be in readiness.

Here are but a few of the component elements for the projected space flight that have to be perfected within the next two years: first and foremost is a reliable rocket engine with a thrust of at least a million pounds to get the capsule-nosed I.C.B.M. off its launching pad and out into space with the required momentum. That there will be some uncertainty even then is indicated by the provision for initial misfiring; the control tower in this case is to be able to lift the one-ton nose-capsule off the pad and set the test pilot down safely in the Atlantic nearby. All along the line, apparently, a successful space journey will require better guidance and control in flight than are now available. If the missile gets off the pad successfully but radar tracking stations find that the man-carrying capsule is not going to orbit, decelerating "retro" rockets are to be fired from the space ship to return it to the water near ships strategically placed for such a disappointing eventuality.

That brings the decelerating rocket into the foreground, a device which is said to be still in a preliminary stage of development. This has been assigned a key role if orbiting is successful, for such rockets are to slow down the capsule and start its re-entry into the earth's atmosphere. Parachutes, which are not as yet fully developed either, are to slow the descent further when the capsule gets down to a height of sixty-thousand feet. Finally, the safe return to one's fellow men requires a type of float that is yet to be perfected for the supposedly gentle landing on the South Atlantic.

Nevertheless, the N.A.S.A. and the young men our space agency has chosen for their stamina, intelligence, knowledge and temperament have little doubt that in another two years or so an American will succeed in circling the earth two or three times at an altitude of one hundred twenty-five miles in from three to four and one-half hours and then drop gently into the South Atlantic and rejoin his fellow men. In view of the developments of the last two or three years—especially Soviet and American rocket and missile achievements—who would be bold enough to differ with these scientists and embryo space-pilots? And once this is granted, who would deny that not long afterward we shall witness the successful visits to the moon, establishment of space stations and other interplanetary wonders which our scientists are so confidently predicting for the fairly near future? Mankind is clearly on the threshold today of greatly expanded knowledge of the universe.

NATIONAL CULTURE FOR FRANCE

FRANCE HAS long had a reputation for showing a lively and serious concern for the arts. The recent statement of André Malraux indicates that this reputation, which the French have nurtured and cherished, is not likely to fade. Speaking as the Minister of State for Cultural Affairs, M. Malraux asserted that the nation's cultural policy was the Government's domain alone. He added that he was willing to discuss with his critics matters of dispute, but not to change his plans for reform. His over-all plans would make available "the highest works of humanity, and first of all those of France, to the greatest possible number of Frenchmen."

Put in these general terms the plans sound neither radical nor original. But translated into particular terms they will represent a real innovation in French theatrical life. For the nationally operated dramatic and lyric theaters presently offer, according to M. Malraux, not the "highest works of humanity" but things of lesser, even of trivial, value. The famed Comédie-Française, for instance, has been offering too little Racine, Corneille and Hugo and

Commonweal Associates

Readers are continuing to send in Charter and Sustaining memberships in the Commonweal Associates as we go to press this week. It is gratifying to report that this Thirty-Fifth Anniversary campaign is going well in its early stages and that it has produced a number of donations as well as memberships. In another two or three weeks we will publish a list of the Associates which will include those who have enrolled since the report published in the April 10 issue, as well as a complete report on the Anniversary campaign to date.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

overmuch of vaudeville comedies. It is the actors who have been controlling the theaters and their control has been unfortunate. The actors, not surprisingly, have reacted against M. Malraux's criticism and proposed changes. But since, as Minister of State, M. Malraux holds the all-important purse strings, he is likely to call the tunes.

M. Malraux's ideas have, in a sense, been successfully tested under the Fourth Republic, when Jean Vilar presented the classics in a national theater and drew capacity audiences. Nevertheless the idea of having such a significant aspect of their culture state-controlled must give pause to more than the actors. The high accomplishments of the people in control, including of course André Malraux himself, suggest that the outcome will be successful—at least while they are in charge. And while France, and other countries, wait to see if the expectations will be fulfilled, the French will continue to keep discussion of artistic matters in the public domain, on a high level, and in alternately heated and dispassionate tones.

DISSENTING DEMOCRATS

SENATOR CLARK of Pennsylvania has joined company with those Democratic leaders who in recent weeks have become increasingly critical of Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson. Younger Democrats in the Senate, he warned the Majority Leader, are becoming "more restless and frustrated week by week" because they have no "real chance" to be heard on matters of party policy.

In particular, Senator Clark is convinced that party leaders made a serious mistake in recent weeks by not fighting for a more ambitious plan for emergency unemployment compensation. Here Senator Clark singled out for specific criticism the fact that Johnson-approved conservatives on the Senate-House conference committee agreed in a matter of minutes to delete a liberalizing amendment from the measure being compromised, despite the fact that the amendment had been approved in the Senate itself by a vote of nearly two-to-one. A minority viewpoint, Senator Clark protested, should not have been allowed to become the Senate's official viewpoint in a Senate-House conference committee, as it clearly did in this instance. Urging more voice in party affairs for all Democratic legislators, Senator Clark warned the Democratic Majority leader that it would be disastrous if an "angry row" were to develop among Democrats in the Senate between the "past and future."

Thus Senator Clark has added his voice to the small chorus that began when Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin publicly criticized Senator Johnson in February. The following month, it will be remembered, Senator McNamara of Michigan charged the Majority Leader was contributing to "a serious breakdown in the majority's responsibility" in the Senate, and a few weeks ago Senator Morse of Oregon charged that Democratic leadership in the Senate had become President Eisenhower's "collusive ally." All this does not mean that Senator Johnson's position is in any real danger, but it is significant nonetheless. The tactics which the Majority Leader from Texas thinks of as compromise and moderation won considerable acclaim in a closely divided Senate; they seem less necessary and less attractive in a body that has a much stronger liberal bloc. Senator Johnson still holds the reins of power, but he is likely to hear more from his critics in the months ahead.

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

THE DEATH of Frank Lloyd Wright has deprived us of one of the great critical voices of our time. Generations have already responded to, or reacted against, Mr. Wright, his ideas and his designs. Some of the buildings he designed have, after decades, become familiar, and with the familiarity has come acceptance. Others will never become familiar or accepted because they proved initially to be too "controversial" and the plans were rejected. Still other buildings continue to arouse excited criticism and defense; if "time is the test" it is evident that there has not yet been sufficient time to test them.

It is his architectural ideas, of course, that have made the greatest impact, but Mr. Wright's was a free-ranging mind and his sharp wit struck at many aspects of our culture. He managed to escape the too-enveloping embrace that frequently muffles the voice of the accepted public figure. When called upon to deliver an address he could be counted on to disconcert his hosts as thoroughly as the audience. Even in his octogenarian years his ideas often outstripped those of his college audiences.

Mr. Wright's ideas will be sifted and selected, some of his buildings will fall into disuse and be replaced, and various critical studies will attempt to take the measure of this man. But in his four score years and nine he produced work of such vision and purpose that his image will endure. He needs no further monument.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On Catholic Education

The Church never loses sight of the fact that her responsibility is to educate, not so much for man's temporal lifetime, as for eternity

by AELRED GRAHAM

IN DISCUSSING Catholic education I intend no challenge, no adverse criticism, no rebuke to "complacency"—which, if it ever existed, must have been reduced to a vanishing point under recent onslaughts by distinguished Catholic educationists. All that I have to offer is an invitation to examine, more closely than perhaps we habitually do, basic principles common to every party within the Church.

For the moment we may leave aside problems bearing upon American education in general. What must first claim our attention, it seems to me, are several antecedent questions bound up with the very nature of Catholicism. Whatever be the specialized preoccupations of individual professors and instructors, the Church never loses sight of the fact that her responsibility is to educate, not so much for man's temporal lifetime, as for eternity. It is part of the authentic Catholic tradition, reaching back to before the New Testament itself, that we are on earth as pilgrims and strangers, that we have here no abiding city. Evangelical Christianity was not a religion for the rationalist and the worldling; the Gospel is based on alienation from the world, from the intellectual world, be it noted, no less than from the world of politics and economics.

In the course of her long history the Church may be said to have accommodated herself somewhat to secular civilization. How else could she have brought her influence to bear on human society? But a question the teaching Church will always ask, when confronted by an educational program, is "What does this avail for eternal life?" That the Catholic hierarchy insist on raising this, in the eyes of some, untimely question today is one proof of the Church's direct descent from primitive Christianity.

Dom Aelred Graham, O. S. B., is the prior of Portsmouth Priory. This article is the substance of a paper recently read by him to the St. Thomas More Society of the Harvard Law School.

Thus, at one level of Catholic thought, education is approached in the spirit of an apostolate. From this point of view, Catholic schools are only secondarily centers of enlightenment, where young people can learn, unhindered, the best that has been thought and said on any given subject. Primarily these schools might be regarded, in some measure at least, as institutions for soul-saving, where information is screened from disturbing elements, protection given against the sophistries and blandishments of a godless intellectualism, and the youthful mind provided with what may be useful to it in its brief passage through this world. Such, briefly, as I understand it, is the fundamental case for separate Church schools. Within its limits, it is an unassailable case.

This separatist attitude represents Christianity's characteristic inheritance from Old Testament Judaism. It was the exclusiveness of Israel which supplied the background of our Lord's own teaching. "Salvation comes from the Jews." To Judaism also the Church owes her sense of history: significance belongs to the past, and even more, to the future.

BUT THERE IS another, no less authentic, aspect of Catholic thought, to which attention must now be given. Catholicism has also a viewpoint which is comprehensive, not exclusive, timeless rather than historically conditioned. This is sometimes alluded to as the Church's legacy from Hellenism, though the phrase is hardly satisfactory, since it might suggest a naturalistic origin for a standpoint that is likewise to be found in the New Testament. What is especially relevant here is St. John's stress on the Incarnate Word as *Truth* and the Fourth Gospel's presentation of "eternal life" as being, not simply in the future, but a reality already possessed by the believer, in virtue of his *knowledge* of God and of Jesus Christ. Thus, Chris-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tianity is committed from the start to the universalism implicit in the concepts of "knowledge" and "truth."

Clearly, our minds are now moving in a different dimension of human thought from that of the Old Testament. What we considered first was the historical, we might call it the *horizontal*, scale of measurement; now we are presented with the supra-historical, the timeless, the—to continue the spatial metaphor—*vertical* aspect of cognition. We look at reality, not as it was or will be, but as it is; and we look at it, or try to do so, with contemplative insight. To know, to understand, partakes in itself of beatitude. "*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.*" Virgil is echoing Socrates, who envisaged heaven, not as some strange new world, but as a place where he would continue to engage in the activity he found most enjoyable in this life—intellectual argument. St. Thomas Aquinas would have appreciated that, since he himself held that the pursuit of Wisdom is the key to abiding joy, both in this world and in the next.

But the two viewpoints, the "horizontal" and the "vertical," the historical and the timeless, the apocalyptic and the metaphysical, call them by what names we please, clearly coalesce in the final realization of God as the *summum bonum*. What emerges for our present purpose, however, is that knowledge has a value for its own sake, apart from its practical utility; knowledge is to the mind what health is to the body, its own justification, an end in itself.

Turning directly to the educational philosophy of Catholics, I submit that the thoughts just now considered may illuminate some of our recent discussions. We find justification, in the first place, for the Church's watchful care over the *conditions* under which her children acquire knowledge. But no less certainly, in virtue of Catholicism's commitment to total *Truth,* validity is given to the free play of the mind, to uninhibited inquiry, to following the argument wheresoever it may lead.

In attempting to illustrate any Catholic theory of education, we can never afford to ignore Cardinal Newman's *The Idea of a University*. Newman's classical treatise is often mentioned, but perhaps not so often read. One or two recent educational pronouncements by Catholics might have been phrased rather more circumspectly, if the Cardinal's careful analysis of the problems had been kept in mind. Not that to differ with Newman is necessarily to be wrong. Much fresh knowledge has come to light since he delivered these lectures to the newly created University of Ireland just over a century ago. But if Newman's educational theories may be supplemented, even, in part, corrected, they cannot safely be disregarded.

We may first recall what, according to Newman, university education is *not*. Lately the question has been publicly asked: "Where are the Catholic Salks, Oppenheimers, Einsteins?" Now that is to make a challenging point; but it is not a point which Newman, to judge by what he says, would have regarded as particularly relevant. "There is no crying demand, no imperative necessity," he writes, "for our acquisition of a Catholic Euclid or a Catholic Newton." Newman argues that it is beside the mark to criticize a "liberal education," which is what he is concerned with, for failing to "lead to discoveries in chemistry, astronomy, geology, magnetism, and science of every kind." Such discoveries are to be expected from research "academies," rather than universities, since the members of a university faculty have the primary function, not of research or writing learned works, but of teaching.

Newman did not consider it to be the task of a university to produce "scholars" or "intellectuals." He is always on the side of common sense as against brilliant eccentricity. "Parti-colored ingenuities," "the random theories and imposing sophistries and dashing paradoxes, which carry away half-formed and superficial intellects" merit only "impatience and disgust." He pours scorn upon "viewiness"—the attitude which implies that it is "almost thought a disgrace not to have a view at a moment's notice on any question, from the Personal Advent to the cholera or mesmerism."

WHAT, THEN, was Newman's positive aim? He is preoccupied with the right kind of "intellectual training"—"to impress upon a boy's mind the idea of science, method, order, principle and system, of rule and exception, of richness and harmony." He strives to remove common defects—"inaccuracy," for example—by encouraging the patient acquisition of sound mental habits. "Boys are always more or less inaccurate, and too many, or rather the majority, remain boys all their lives. . . . What is more common than the sight of grown men, talking on political or moral or religious subjects, in that offhand idle way, which we signify by the word *unreal?* 'That they simply do not know what they are talking about' is the spontaneous silent remark of any man of sense who hears them."

Following Aristotle, and what has been called the perennial philosophy, Newman believes that education's first task is to correct the waywardness of the untrained human intelligence. Rather than any spectacular intellectual achievements, he proposes for a university an objective as modest as it is worthwhile. He would have the student body so instructed that they are no longer among those who "have no difficulty in contradicting themselves in successive sentences, without being conscious of it"; those who "can never look straight before them, never see the point"; those who are "hopelessly prejudiced and obstinate, and after having been driven from their opinions, return to them the next moment without even an attempt to explain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why"; those who are "so intemperate and intractable that there is no greater calamity for a good cause than that they should get hold of it." These are some of the "intellectual infirmities" which, in Cardinal Newman's view, debar their victims, whatever specialized academic qualifications they may have, from being classed as educated men.

For Newman, a university exists to impart knowledge, not *per se* to instill virtue. "If then a university is a direct preparation for this world, let it be what it professes. It is not a convent, it is not a seminary; it is a place to fit men of the world for the world." The curriculum should be such as to prepare a boy for the status of "the statesman, the landholder, or the opulent gentleman." What is aimed at is not, directly, "the manners and habits of gentlemen"—these may be acquired by, among other means, "the innate grace and dignity of the Catholic mind"—but a certain quality of the informed intelligence. The educational "desideratum," in Newman's opinion, consists in: "the force, the steadiness, the comprehensiveness, and the versatility of intellect, the command over our own powers, the instinctive just estimate of things as they pass before us, which sometimes indeed is a natural gift, but commonly is not gained without much effort and the exercise of years."

Newman's basic thesis is that a university education consists in the "cultivation of the intellect"; and the intellect is cultivated by the apprehension of truth. "Truth of whatever kind is the proper object of the intellect; its cultivation then lies in fitting it to apprehend and contemplate truth."

The acquiring of real knowledge, Newman asserts, is "not by a direct and simple vision, not at a glance, but, as it were, by piecemeal and accumulation, by a mental process, by going round an object, by the comparison, the combination, the mutual correction, the continual adaptation, of many partial notions, by the employment, concentration, and joint action of many faculties and exercises of mind." Being so disciplined, the intellect acquires a "faculty of judgment, of clear-sightedness, of sagacity, of wisdom, of philosophical reach of mind, and of intellectual self-possession and repose." Once the "right standard" for this educational goal has been set up, all students must be helped forward towards it "according to their various capacities." "This," writes the Cardinal, "I conceive to be the business of a university."

HOW MANY Catholic educators would agree with Newman today? The question cuts across the division between "denominational" and "non-sectarian" colleges, and bears upon the general quality of contemporary American education. As for the many problems surrounding the education of Catholics in a secular milieu, is it too much to suggest that a little light may be thrown upon them by earlier reflections in this paper? Some of us, by temperament, training and childhood background, will embody that "separatist" emphasis, through which what St. Paul calls the "Israel of God," the Church, was, and still is, preserved from contamination by the world.

Others, by contrast, embodying the incarnational emphasis of St. John and the Greek Fathers, will rejoice, again with St. Paul, in the liberty of spirit which responds eagerly to all that is true or lovely or of good report, from whatever source it may come. Each of these emphases, given loyalty to the Church's teaching authority, is authentically Catholic; they fulfill and complement one another. Newman exemplified both.

On both sides of the "iron curtain," there are people eager to change the world, change it, as they think, for the better; but are they prepared to undertake the laborious and indispensable preliminary task, that of first understanding what they desire to improve? Human salvation, obviously, cannot be attained by such devices as nuclear armaments and inter-planetary missiles; but neither can it be reached merely by good intentions and religious zeal. Incalculable harm has been done by unenlightened good intentions; religious zeal, uninformed by breadth of vision, degenerates all too easily into a blundering fanaticism. Charity and compassion—humanity's perennial needs—are often best served with the minimum of emotion, by constructive action based on the logic of facts, in the cool, clear light of the faith-endowed reason.

It is here, I suggest, that our Catholic universities and colleges may enter confidently into their own. If they are not always in a position to produce scholars and intellectuals, they are well equipped for the task no less important in a democracy—the task of raising the level of popular understanding. The prospect for humanity's future would be much brighter than it is if the average individual were rather less gullible; if his first reaction to the incessant propaganda to which he is nowadays subjected—political, economic, commercial—were one of healthy skepticism, or at least of critical detachment.

Can it seriously be maintained that the Western democracies are meeting the Communist threat with greater insight, maturer wisdom, a less degree of ignorance and stupidity, than supplied the prelude to World Wars I and II? The rational instruments for shaping the youthful intelligence into a state of judicious awareness have been preserved by the Church; they were inherited from Aristotle, readapted by Aquinas, and sharpened to the highest precision by Newman himself. Again, we may recall the great Cardinal's definition of "real cultivation of mind"—"the instinctive just estimate of things as they pass before us." How simple it sounds; yet is not this the intellectual pearl beyond price?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jordan finds itself
isolated in a sea of troubles

Formosa of the Middle East

by DON PERETZ

ON A RECENT JOURNEY through the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, I was struck by the tremendous expansion of nearly all the urban centers. Amman, ancient Jerash, Irbed on the east bank of the Jordan River, Jerusalem, Hebron, Bethlehem, Nablus, Tulkaram and Qualquilya on the west or Palestine side of the river—all have enormously increased in size during the past decade. Today they are bustling centers of activity.

Irbed, for instance, near the Syrian frontier, which a decade ago had a population of about fifteen thousand, is now crammed to its edges with eighty thousand people, and nestled up to the edge of town is a large refugee camp where some eight thousand of the fifteen thousand Palestinians in Irbed dwell. The wretched tents which marked such encampments only a few years ago are gone now, and permanent huts make the camp seem like a vital part of the town.

"How do Irbed's people live?" I asked the U.N.R.W.A. official, a former Jaffa resident, who was my host at the camp. "Don't ask!" was his reply. "Actually Irbed can support a population of between twenty and twenty-five thousand. Take away the present refugee population—which is most unlikely in the near future—and that leaves you a surplus of some forty thousand people. The city's population is swollen to at least twice its economic capacity."

In exactly the same way, the population of the entire state of Jordan is today swollen to nearly twice the country's economic capacity. Of the approximately one and a half million Jordanians, nearly a third are refugees whose homes and property are within the borders of neighboring Israel. Something like another third are Palestinians who live on the west bank. Most of the latter are still in their homes, but nearly two hundred thousand of them were cut off from their lands as a result of the 1949 armistice agreement between Israel and King Abdullah's government. This means that nearly half of the entire community lost their livelihood as a direct result of the Palestine war. Is it any wonder that bitterness prevails among the Palestine Arabs?

In truth, a nihilistic hatred of just about everyone marks any political conversation with these people. The targets of their barbed remarks include Israel, Great Britain, the United States, the United Nations, King Abdullah and his successsors, the former Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, and most other Arab leaders. Only Gamal Abdel Nasser is an exception.

My conversation with a Palestinian who now runs a dry goods shop in the heart of Amman was a typical example. His responses, it should be remembered, were not those of an illiterate participant in mob frenzy. He is an American University of Beirut graduate who reads not only the Egyptian press but *Time* and other anti-Nasser publications. Nevertheless, he has the greatest respect for the U.A.R. President.

"So far," he told me, "it is only Nasser who has done anything about social reform. Only he has stood up to the West when they tried to beat him down. He is truly representative of Arab nationalism." He went on bitterly to say, "I could go to jail for talking to you like this, but I don't give a damn any more. What have we got to live for?"

NONETHELESS, even Nasser has his ups and downs in popularity. While driving up to Irbed, for instance, I was accompanied by a Palestinian U.N.R.W.A. official. It was the second anniversary of the attack on Egypt by Great Britain, France and Israel, and *Swat al-Arab* (The Voice of the Arabs—from Cairo) was celebrating the "victory" with day-long paeans of praise for the "glorious forces" which had resisted the invaders. Throughout the broadcast there were, of course, vituperative attacks on the British, French and—paradoxically, despite the stand of the United States in 1956—on the "American imperialists," together with invidious comparisons with the "friendly hand extended by the Soviet Union." Every program, from news reports to the songs of the great Egyptian singer, Abdel Wahab, glorified the "heroic stand" against the foreign devils.

By evening, when we were returning to Amman, the air waves were still filled with this patriotic fervor. Suddenly my host ordered the driver to switch off the radio.

Mr. Peretz has traveled extensively in the Middle East. This is his first appearance in The Commonweal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Nobody cares about us!" he exploded. "All those Egyptians care about is themselves. We've been listening since morning and there hasn't been one mention of the refugees," he complained.

Thus Nasser is more a symbol of unrest and discontent in Jordan than the leader of some constructive force. Around his image have been gathered all the frustrations, lost hopes and bitterness of the Jordanians, who really don't know what they want. And here is a large part of King Hussein's problem.

Although nobody seems to hate the "brave little king," the government finds it difficult to work up popular enthusiasm for him. And this despite the fact that every opportunity to do so is exploited, since the only hope rests with him. A faint hope it is, though, as evidenced by the popular attitude toward Samir Rifai, Hussein's prime minister.

If King Hussein is spared the onus of mass vituperation, Samir Rifai, the actual ruler of Jordan today, most assuredly is not. "If only it weren't for Rifai and those others around the King, everything would be so much better," I heard again and again from all kinds of Jordanians, who view Rifai as a kind of evil genius guiding the young monarch's hand. Nevertheless, although he is probably one of the most unpopular men in the Arab world today, Samir Rifai is also one of its most clever, even astute, political figures. "He is the most impressive figure in the Middle East I have met," one experienced diplomat told me. "He seems perfectly relaxed and at ease—completely sure of himself despite the regime's unpopularity."

Apparently not quite so sure of themselves are the Jordan security authorities. Although there are occasional evasions, the press is rigidly censored. And if the atmosphere in Amman is not as repressive as that in Damascus or Baghdad today, it takes only a walk down a few streets to see that the government is taking no chances about security. On nearly every block in the center of the capital, Amman, there are little clusters of armed police and military, many of whom wear the red checkered kufiya (headcloth) of the old Arab Legion. It is, consequently, almost impossible to get Jordanians to talk in hotel lobbies or other public places about anything except the archaelogical sites at Jerash and Petra, for they know that they are being watched and listened to by Rifai's men.

IN CONSIDERING Jordan's problems, it is important to remember that within Jordan itself there is no difference between the Arab refugees and other Arab residents. All Palestinians are Jordanian citizens, and many of them, including refugees, have cabinet and other highly responsible government posts. All vote, pay taxes (if they have the money), serve in the army, police, or frontier forces, and have as much—or as little—freedom as any other citizen. As far as the Jordan government is concerned, there is no such thing as legal refugee status, a classification used only by U.N.R.W.A. for the purpose of distributing rations and other services.

It therefore hardly makes sense to say that Jordan has done nothing about the refugees. Legally, it has absorbed all within its borders, and only in Jordan is this the case, for in other Arab states it is extremely difficult if not impossible for Palestine Arab refugees to become citizens.

But herein lies the dilemma. Without granting citizenship to the Palestinians, the Hashimite Kingdom would have had no justification for taking over those parts of Western Palestine which it acquired after the war with Israel. Furthermore, the Palestinians provide most of the competent personnel that exist in the middle and lower echelons of government. But the other side of the coin is trouble—endless trouble, for the Palestinians are a restless, volatile people in search of a lost identity and a lost homeland. They are open to the most disruptive political agitation, and it is they who are the source of the unrest which will probably lead to the demise of Jordan as an independent entity.

Even the most optimistic projects for bolstering the Jordanian economy, if successfully completed, would provide for absorption of, at most, two-thirds of the present population of a million and a half. And there is great doubt if even these blueprints for developing the nation's water, mineral, agricultural and other meager resources can be fulfilled.

The country has no means of its own to finance such projects. It lacks technicians, administrators, the resolve of the population, and the forward outlook for such an extensive program. And even with massive foreign economic and technical assistance, it still remains doubtful if Jordan can complete economic development projects which would absorb two-thirds of its present population.

Furthermore, after many surveys of the area, Eric Johnston concluded that there is just not enough water in the Jordan-Yarmuk system to provide for the full needs of both Israel and Jordan. To achieve an equitable distribution of the area's river resources both na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions would have to trim their development programs considerably. In any case, successful completion of the Johnston plan for regional development of the Jordan River and the Yarmuk project for harnessing that stream would take twenty years and even then would absorb, at most, a third of the present surplus population.

Economic limitations, however, are only part of the difficulty. To ensure equitable use of resources which might be developed in any great project, a drastic social upheaval would be necessary in Jordan. The whole system of land ownership in the prospective development areas would have to be altered or else the benefits would accrue to only a small handful of large estate owners who today control the vast areas of the Jordan valley in which Mr. Johnson's scheme would be carried out. Refugees who moved into the area under the present system of land ownership would find themselves mere hired hands or exploited tenants of semi-feudal masters rather than independent owners. But altering the present system of land tenure would require major political changes in the present system of government, because the most important decisions are now made by the very owners who would be directly affected if fundamental social and economic reforms were to be carried out.

HOW THEN, does Jordan keep alive today? By the grace of God and the economic assistance received from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (U.N.R.W.A.). The two Western powers pour in enough economic aid to keep the security forces intact, and to prevent the administrative service of the government from collapsing. The international agency keeps the refugee third of the population from starving. Together all these foreign grants provide as much as two-thirds of the national income, which is still less than $100 per person.

What are the alternatives to the present situation? No one seems to have a conclusive answer. The vocal popular enthusiasm for Nasser does not necessarily mean that there is a strong desire for amalgamation with the U.A.R. Too many Jordanians are aware of the disappointments which the Syrian enthusiasts for union met after consummation of the marriage with Egypt. And a vast desert, as well as differences in social structure, and political outlook, separates the Palestinians from the new Republic of Iraq.

On the west, Israel is following a policy of watchful waiting—of armed watchful waiting. It is doubtful if any reasonable Israeli would be willing to move into the heavily Arab populated sections of Palestine for more than a temporary excursion. The security-conscious Israelis are already having their problems with an Arab minority of twelve and a half per cent. They are hardly likely deliberately to increase that minority to a third of the total population. And such a rash move would also alienate world opinion.

Iraq's present policy seems to be similar to that of Israel—watchful waiting. As for President Nasser, although he is not immediately taking any moves to absorb the troublesome Palestinians within his borders, he will no doubt take every opportunity to incite them against their own government and against the "Western imperialists." If they are a disquieting element, it is the British and Americans who will have to deal with the problem, not the U.A.R.

Thus, although on all sides powerful forces are waiting for the demise of Jordan, none seems at present prepared to take the calculated risk of tumbling the rickety government. Jordan is not an island in a geographic sense, but today it finds itself politically isolated in a sea of troubles. Its position is, ultimately, an untenable one, unless some political miracle takes place.

Jordan is now being kept together by baling wire and chewing gum—American chewing gum. The combination of Samir Rifai and boy king is at this time about the best available from the United States point of view if Jordan is to go on as a separate state.

What about the future? The best answer I have heard, or perhaps I should say the least bad, came from a U.S. official. "The best we can hope for," he said, "is to keep pouring blood into the nation's veins. Perhaps we can keep it alive until the Middle East political situation settles. Jordan is a temporary holding operation, just like Formosa. We have to hold on until we feel sure our departure will not make a worse mess than the one we are already in!"

MEETING

I turned
And stupid staring
saw the sundials fretted
with the scars of shadowed moments
born forever in communion of identity.

And watched the hundred patient moons
each permanent
and old beyond its years.

The world leaned heavy on its staff
and waited
for no star could turn
against the fragment
of the night-grey gull
who hung and soared and tried
to make forever now.

JOHN CHRISTOPHER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A WORD FOR TOLERANCE

I WOULD LIKE to say a word for tolerance. I suppose the best way to begin is by saying something against tolerance. For if I do not there will be letters in the next mail pointing out that the word is often used to describe a wishy-washy indifferentism and lack of conviction about anything. Unfortunately, this is so. Some people do seem to hold that the only way they can be tolerant of their neighbors is to believe that their neighbors' beliefs and convictions are probably as right—or as wrong—as theirs are. Well, all I can say is that some people are mistaken.

If the only way we can be tolerant is by denying differences are real or that principles matter or that ideas have consequences, then our hold on tolerance is tenuous indeed. Tolerance implies a respect for another person not because he is wrong or even because he is right but because he is human.

There is another frequently repeated criticism of the word. It is said that the word tolerance is too weak. It has a negative ring. It suggests a passive, almost grudging acceptance of others rather than an active reaching out. It lacks dynamism. It is not as strong, for instance, as the word charity.

There is something to this criticism, though I think it is usually overdrawn. Charity is a theological concept. Yet in the sense that grace is built on nature, charity is built on tolerance. Certainly tolerance can be enriched and supernaturalized by the virtue of charity. But when I use the word tolerance I am not thinking of the Christian ideal; I am thinking of the civic ideal, put forth as a non-theological virtue.

What does the word tolerance imply? It implies a willingness to communicate and to do so on terms which make real communication possible. It implies a willingness to listen to another person and understand what he is saying, even when he says it badly. It implies a willingness to make oneself understood, even when one's auditors seem determined to misunderstand.

Why should one want to understand others and to be understood by them? Not, I would say, merely to win arguments or to score debating points. That can be the height of egotism. The man who values tolerance should get worried when he leaves his opponent speechless and his audience in silent awe of his prowess. A kind of violence is required for such victories, and violence is the archenemy of tolerance.

I hope I will not be misunderstood when I say that the purpose of communication is not the defense of abstract truth. Probably that is a poor way to say what I have in mind. What I mean to say is that no service is done to the truth when it is put forth in such a way that it repels those who hear it. Indeed, it might be better in that case if the truth were left undefended, for the battering it receives at the hands of its defenders may distort it so cruelly it is no longer recognizable.

The tolerant man would rather lose an argument than lose a friend. This statement, too, can be easily misunderstood. Let me spell out what I mean. I do not believe that any true friendship is possible when one party feels it necessary to betray his principles in order to hold the affection of the other. On the other hand, I do not believe that the man who uses even the truth to wound another values friendship as highly as he should. Moreover, and this is probably even more serious, he does not value the truth as much as he should, for he wields it like a death-dealing sword.

We have a phrase; we say we *"have* the truth." What does it mean to say, "I *have* the truth"? I have asked myself that question. I do not think I have found a good answer yet, I am sure that to have the truth should mean something more than the comfort which comes with certitude; it should even mean more than the satisfaction one always finds in grasping reality. I think it should also mean that one has to consider himself a custodian of something terribly precious. The truth one has should be communicated to others but it must be given with infinite delicacy, lest it lose some of its majesty in the transfer. And here, I think, is the major argument against the intolerant. It is not that they have an excess of zeal in their care for the truth, as is often claimed; it is that they are so careless and irreverent in their treatment of the truth. It is a question, as Father Gerald Vann once put it, of the *mode* of truth. When what is communicated is not really the truth, which has its own appeal, but the egoism, combativeness, greed or aggressiveness of those who think of themselves as defenders of the truth, then truth has been violated.

So, while its author confesses a hundred habitual sins in this regard, let this be a word for tolerance. Let it say that rather than being the enemy of truth, tolerance serves truth more faithfully than zeal. Let it say that in an age when the truth was handed down by princely authority and gratefully accepted, tolerance may not have been prized as it is today, but that in our age when the truth if it is to be communicated at all must be freely communicated and freely accepted by free men, tolerance is the necessary mode of its communication. In all ages, the truth suffered at the hands of the intolerant, who made it seem ugly and drove good men from embracing it. But in our time, intolerance is by far the greatest enemy of the truth, especially when it poses as its greatest friend.

JOHN COGLEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SCREEN

HAVE CAMERA, WILL TRAVEL

WHILE INTERNATIONAL film making and the widely-traveled camera sound like good ideas, the films themselves do not always come up to expectations. Two new movies, beautifully photographed abroad, are good examples.

With its Italian-French-Yugoslavian production and American-European cast, "Tempest" is about as international as a film can get. Based on stories by Alexander Pushkin (about Pugachov's revolt against Catherine II and about a young officer's romance with a captain's daughter), its eighteenth-century scenes shift from Catherine's plush palace in St. Petersburg to the rural towns and forts in the steppes of southeastern Russia. Handsomely filmed in Technicolor and Technirama in Italy and Yugoslavia, the picture uses the elegant Royal Palace of Caserta near Naples as the setting for Catherine's court, a wooden set built near Belgrade to duplicate the old Russian village and fort of Bjelogorsk, and the Dolovo Plain for the battle scenes of Orenburg. These battle sequences are magnificently done, and here I think Producer Dino DeLaurentiis even outdoes the magnificently-staged battle scenes in his earlier "War and Peace."

Yet with all its elaborate costumes, settings and fine international cast, "Tempest" has on the whole an artificial and contrived flavor that its good individual scenes cannot overcome. The screenplay, written by Louis Peterson and Alberto Lattuada from the Pushkin tales, does not match the depth or nobility of its revolutionary ideas; the film's themes are never developed fully, and they become merely an excuse for the elaborate decorations and the minor romantic sub-plot.

Alberto Lattuada's direction seems terribly uneven. He did well with Van Heflin as Pugachov, the scheming visionary, and with Viveca Lindfors, who makes a beautiful and imperial Catherine—and with Robert Keith and Agnes Moorehead, as the Bjelogorsk captain and his wife—but Geoffrey Horne and Silvana Mangano, though attractive to look at, are quite wooden as the young couple who survive the revolution's and Catherine's excesses to prove their love. Unfortunately, in telling its personal stories "Tempest" is sluggish, even though as a historical spectacle it is pageantry on the grand scale.

ALSO ATTEMPTING to combine history, pageantry and a love story is "The Naked Maja," which was made in Rome and purports to tell of the affair between the Spanish painter Goya and the Duchess of Alba. Except for its lush Technicolor and Technirama photography, the picture doesn't succeed on any score. Scriptwriters Norman Corwin and Giorgio Prosperi garbled the biographical facts to make an old-fashioned melodrama; and while Producer Goffredo Lombardo was willing to spare no expense in showing the corruption at the court of Carlos IV (Gino Cervi) and Maria Luisa (Lea Padovani), his picture shows little thought other than in its handsome visuals.

Much of the fault throughout lies, I think, in the weak script and in the direction of Henry Koster, who failed to make even a good melodrama out of the material provided and whose two leads obviously needed stronger guidance than he gave them. Anthony Franciosa, as the hot-headed young liberal who painted with an angry vehemence, and Ava Gardner, as the beautiful duchess who panted and posed for the painter, walk through their roles most of the time as if they weren't quite sure what was expected. The picture has its moments, of course, and a few of the scenes have a Goyaesque color and satirical bite, but admirers of the great painter have a right to expect more. If Goya's story is ever done again without so much emphasis on international stars and the far-flung camera, perhaps they will get it.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

THE STAGE

ENSEMBLE

OUR TOWN: Mr. Thornton Wilder's reverie of innocence, mortality and the mind of God, gently rendered by Mr. Jose Quintero and Circle in the Square for a generation new to its intimacy and light.

SWEET BIRD OF YOUTH: An ultimate technical bravura marks Mr. Tennessee Williams' latest—last?—parable of violation, yet a lyric unity too, not immediately obvious and not sufficiently praised. Miss Geraldine Page brings, freshly, a vicious splendor and magnitude to her humors, though it is Mr. Paul Newman who extends the play into a macabre poetics.

J.B.: The season's enigma, and an inexhaustible source of those cultural causeries which indicate the presence of an intellectual forum rather than an embodied experience. Myself, I regret to report the whole as an especially melancholy instance of American abstraction, incoherent as drama, theology or sense, and skull-flattening in its terminal boredom.

REDHEAD: Miss Gwen Verdon vividly incendiary among the damp rodomontade of Broadway-as-usual.

LA MADRE: A chronicle, in the superior devotional vein at Blackfriars, of Teresa of Avila as conventual reformer and personality. An admirable penetration of Spanish religious psychology, though one might have wished for more emphasis on Teresa as mystic.

RICHARD HAYES.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Exchange of Views

I—Socialism in Europe

Rome, Italy.

TO THE EDITORS: It would seem that it is Michael P. Fogarty, rather than the Church, who needs to be brought up to date regarding Socialism and Catholicism ["Socialism in Europe," Dec. 19] The condemnation which Pius XI wrote, in *Quadragesimo Anno,* of Marxism—whether in its Communist or Socialist dress—still stands, and the reasons given are as good now if not better than they were when originally given.

It might be well for Mr. Fogarty to consult *Christentum und Demokratischer Sozialismus,* Munich, Karl Zink Verlag, 1958. He might also read the article written by Father Antonio Messineo, S.J., entitled *Socialismo Democratico e Cristianesimo,* printed December 6, 1958, in the authoritative publication *Civilta Cattolica.* And if this is not enough, let him read the article entitled "Convergenze Inesistenti" which appeared in the semi-official Vatican daily *L'Osservatore Romano,* January 20, 1959.

It is indeed surprising that Mr. Fogarty, who presumes to be an authority on Christian Democracy, should say the things he said in his article on "Socialism in Europe." He has but to consult the writings of the father of Christian Democracy, Don Luigi Sturzo—especially those published during the post-war period —to understand why it is that Christian Democrat voters cannot accept Socialism. . . .

Thanks in part to the hammer blows and the political genius of that towering Christian figure, Konrad Adenauer, German and European Socialists find themselves in grave difficulties, if not in crisis. The course of post-war history has compelled Social Democrats to shed obsolete and exploded portions of their Marxist baggage and to polish and highlight the liberal elements of their wares which they now offer voters.

Catholics have their own social teaching and need not borrow stones from the rubbish pile thrown up by the writers of the French Enlightenment and the subsequent Revolution for the construction of their Christian social edifice. It is not enough for Social-Democrats to mouth phrases so dear to Continental Liberals in order to captivate the minds and votes of the Christian electorate.

For the Catholic, the two luminous realities are God and man: God from whose sovereign prerogatives over man spring man's inalienable rights. It is this which explains why the Church has ever defended God's right over the world, and this, too, is why the Church has down through the ages, since that wondrous day of Pentecost, defended man and his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Catholics cannot accept the doctrine that a citizen must look upon the State as the source of his well-being and his thought. Against the Liberals, the Church will always defend the right of parents to educate their children in free schools of their own choosing; against Marxists, the Church will always defend the institution of private property; and finally, against the subversive secularist *weltanschauung* of Liberalism and Marxism, the Church will continue to propose, as ever, its Incarnational world view. With the birth of the Church came the birth of freedom in the Western World; that Church which is the extension in history of the Incarnation; that Church commissioned by Christ to preach his saving evangel; that Church against which the gates of hell will not prevail.

Catholics have a doctrinal corpus regarding the State, Society, the family, the person, and private property and their inter-relations. Secularist and agnostic Liberalism as well as the atheist materialism of Marxism are but prison balls and chains that hold back man's progress towards the uplands of a better world. It is not enough for the Social-Democrats to jettison their Marxist heritage, nor is it enough for them to rediscover and mouth the clichés of Continental Liberalism. European Catholics have available political parties of Christian inspiration in which and through which they can work for the building of a better world. And over these parties looms the guiding light of the Mystical Body of Christ, His Church, our Mother, ever solicitous that man attain that blessed vision in Paradise, for which man was created.

JOSEPH M. CALDERON.

REPLY

Cardiff, Wales.

TO THE EDITORS: This is the sort of statement that brings the Church into contempt.

(1) It is mere ignorant foolery to talk of the "rubbish pile" thrown up by the writers of the Enlightenment and their successors. That the Church has a profound social doctrine is true. But that this doctrine has been the inspiration of all or even of most of the valid achievements of modern social development is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not true; though happily it is coming to be much more true today than it was a generation or two ago. Among the achievements which were *not* spearheaded by Catholics are American, British and Scandinavian democracy, political, social, and economic. In the building of Swiss and Dutch democracy Catholics have had only a minority, though a very important, part. We cannot claim credit for the rise of more than a fraction of the labor movement, for more than a minority share in the development of the social services, for the rise of modern management and of the human relations movement in industry, for the battle to understand and defeat the trade cycle, or for that matter for the advance of technology, to which we owe our hope of breaking the Malthusian barrier. Protestants and the heirs of the Enlightenment (including the Marxists) have contributed far more than ourselves to these things, and we Catholics have been proud to share in their achievements; also in their ideas. The ideas of Keynes or Beveridge or Elton Mayo, or for that matter of Sidney and Beatrice Webb and Karl Marx, have shaped the way of thought of Catholics as of everyone else. It is chiefly since the second world war that we Catholics have begun to enter the running as intellectual and practical leaders in the battle with the problems of a technical age. We may thank God for what we are now able to do, but let us not claim too much for our modest beginnings or deny the merits of others.

(2) One does not make a concrete judgment, such as "How shall I vote?", by setting up an abstraction labelled "Marxism" and demolishing it as a professor might in a classroom. A political or social movement is a living and developing thing, and must be judged by what it actually is and not as a textbook hypothesis. Among the parties affiliated to the Socialist International some, notably the British Labor Party, are and always have been inoffensive to Catholics. Others, notably in the Latin countries, still hold firmly to views such as were condemned in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Others, like the parties of Holland and Germany, are at a transitional stage. They may be currently on one side of the line or the other, but certainly they are moving fast and far. Indeed, all the parties are on the move. One of the points of my article was that the Labor Party has moved much closer to Continental socialism—yet without coming under the condemnation of the Church—as well as the Continental socialists moving towards the Labor Party. If Mr. Calderon had insisted that in this transitional, mobile situation no blanket approval of modern socialism is in order, he would have been right. But in that case he would merely have said what I said in my article.

(3) I suspect that Erhard has hit more hammer-blows at State-worship than Adenauer: but let that pass, for I too have a great admiration for Dr. Adenauer. But change in socialism is not an invention of postwar Christian Democracy, though competition from Christian Democracy has certainly helped. (So has competition by American Republicans and Democrats, English or Canadian Conservatives, Canadian or Swiss Liberals, or farmer parties in Australia or Scandinavia, all of which are parties where Christians are active, but not parties "of Christian inspiration.")

Revisionism and "religious socialism" have their roots well before 1900. Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin had a very great shock effect. And socialists do not need to look beyond the doctrines common in their own movement to find grounds for an interest in human rights or in a cooperative rather than a state-run society. The shift in socialist doctrine has of course still to be completed, and more so in some countries than in others. Mr. Calderon might rightly have said that socialists can expect Catholic support only in so far as they genuinely admit the rights of man and cure themselves of Statolatry, and that not all have yet done so. But in that case, once again, he would have said no more than I said in my article.

(4) Christian Democracy, like Social Democracy, must be studied as a concrete reality and not as an abstraction. One must beware of the heresy, which Luigi Sturzo (since he has been mentioned) has through his life so deliberately avoided, of treating action by Catholics within a Christian-label party as in some sense more Christian—or, still worse, more identified with the Church—than action under a label like Republican, Democratic, Conservative, or Fianna Fail. A political party is a tool of action, not an article of faith. I trust that Catholics will always cause their political action to be presided over by the "luminous realities" of the Church's doctrine. But there are many different and (so far as the Church is concerned) equally legitimate ways of realizing that doctrine. Those Christians who are also democrats have two widely different traditions. The Christian democracy of America, of Ireland, or of the British Commonwealth relies on the Christian who, trained and inspired by Christian principles, goes forth to play his part in unions or parties or other associations common to all citizens. On the Continent of Europe the tradition is instead of the Christian-label movement in which Christians of all political shades link up. Each method is appropriate in particular circumstances and each is fully approved by the hierarchy in the countries concerned. I doubt if there is a Bishop in the length and breadth of Britain, Ireland, and America who would recommend moving to get up a Christian-Democratic party. Each system, also, tends to be defended by Catholics who live under it with a fanaticism worthy of a better cause. It is as difficult, as I know from having often tried, to convince those with experience of Anglo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish-American politics that a Christian Democratic party can ever be more than a regrettable necessity as it would be, I should imagine, to convince Mr. Calderon that such a party could ever be anything but a gift of God.

The choice is actually one not of principle but of strategy and tactics. There is no reason—coming to Mr. Calderon's specific point—why the right vehicle for Christian political or social action in Western Europe should always and forever be the Christian-label movement. Christian parties or trade unions are mere human creations, subject to the same faults as movements under other labels, and to some of their own: one must always beware of comparing the Christian-Democratic *ideal* with the Socialist or Liberal *reality*.

We have lately seen some striking proofs in Italy of how Christian-Democrats share the ordinary faults of politicians. For all Dr. Adenauer's services, I could quote quite a few from German politics as well. It is therefore perfectly legitimate to query whether the model that has served in the past will serve as well in the future.

In France, for example, should the C.F.T.C. unions combine with *Force Ouvrière*? In Holland, should the traditional lines linking religion and party be broken through? Mr. Calderon can very properly argue that the time for a breakthrough has not come in Holland, or in Italy, or in Germany: I dare say I would often agree with him. But he has no right to hold up his hands in horror at the thought that a breakthrough *might* come. For to treat a switch from one approach to Christian-Democracy to another as a heresy is to deify what is merely a tool of public convenience.

(5) Finally, I must protest against debate by name-calling. To accuse opponents of "mouthing phrases," in which presumably they do not really believe, is no way for a Christian to argue. You may like the leaders of the Socialist International or not. But do not accuse them of hypocrisy unless you are much surer of your ground than I, who know many such people personally, can manage to be. MICHAEL P. FOGARTY.

II—The Meaning of Racism

Loretto, Pa.

TO THE EDITORS: "The Meaning of Racism," which appeared in your February 6 issue, is slanted, biased and completely lacking in understanding. For some time I've watched with great interest the integration struggle in the South and read one article after another as they appear in our Northern press, and always they are of the extremist nature of Father Dunne's. I have yet to see one article that either showed true understanding of the situation or tried to present the case objectively. How can so many intelligent and, I believe, sincere men paint such a one-sided picture? "The Meaning of Racism" is certainly not the worst of these articles, but nevertheless I feel obliged to challenge it.

No one can possibly form an intelligent opinion on this issue without knowing something of its long history. I'm sure that opinions have been bandied about since the first of New England's ships brought slaves to Virginia, but now with nearly one hundred years of abolition behind us we are in much better position to judge the issues purely on the facts.

In these facts lie my greatest objections to Father Dunne's article. Anyone may look back to Civil War days and see the furor stirred up by the extreme Abolitionists, who wanted, overnight, to free a people so long in bondage. Anyone can see the bloody war which was the fruit of their ill-directed labor, and anyone looking a little deeper can also see the bitterness, hatred, and suffering which they also caused, evils which have not died but lie smoldering in the hearts of our people. This is why, now, I must strike out at the extremist nature of Father Dunne's article.

Today, extreme integrationists seem not to be aware of their Abolitionist predecessors and rush wildly down the same road, writing slanted stories, half-truths, and playing on the emotions of the people. Will they continue until once again the streets run with the blood of brothers slain by brothers?

Father Dunne's article also adds to this bitterness by its distortions of facts such as ". . . the already splendid history of Negro forbearance." Can Father Dunne be unaware of such atrocities as Nat Turner's Rebellion or John Brown's Raid; or, if not unaware of them, then unaware of their lasting effect on the people of the South?

Judging by the tone of Father Dunne's article, I feel that he would heap praise, even as the abolitionist, Garrison, did in his infamous *Liberator*, upon the young Negro minister, self-appointed messenger of God and deliverer of his people, who, in August of 1831, staged a bloody insurrection. It was not a revolt against the legendary slave-driving tyrant, but against a generous middle-class planter on the upper James River, against a man who had sacrificed to allow this Negro to be trained for the ministry. In gratitude, Nat Turner massacred his master and his family in the middle of the night, and not satisfied with his work with an axe, laved strips of the bed linen in their blood that he and his followers might sport them as banners while they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rode that night on a spree of such crimes. If you can imagine the terror this insurrection and John Brown's abolitionist-sponsored raid raised in the hearts of every Southerner, go a step further and imagine the bitterness, hatred and confusion in their hearts when they found these men held up as heroes by people like Garrison and even compared to Christ by some Northern newspapers. . . .

And now Father Dunne raises Martin Luther King and fans the embers which have lain so long into the bright flame of bitter hatred. Of course, King doesn't extol the methods of Turner, but we all know that there is a force much greater than armed might and a wound much deeper than that of the sword.

This is not a defense of slavery or segregation. It is a most sincere plea for understanding and moderation. Look back at the events before that useless War. What would have happened had the moderate "Virginia Plan" been followed or, for that matter, if any cry for moderation had been heard? Even now, this plea may be too late. Already, schools have been bombed and the dying, or better said, dormant Klu Klux Klan has begun to show great activity. The sudden force of the Supreme Court and the civil rights legislation of Congress has only broadened the gap between North and South, has only forced these people to secret acts of terror to hold to their traditions.

I am only a student and I make no pretentious claim to profound understanding or to the wisdom which belongs to age, but I know in my heart that good grows slowly even in our holy Church, and that evil comes as fast upon us as did the blitzkrieg of World War II. WALTER F. MARSHALL.

REPLY

Santa Clara, Calif.

TO THE EDITORS: Mr. Marshall is right. I confess to a strong bias against anyone who, whether as an expression of a false philosophy or of a deeply rooted social tradition or of a grievance suffered by his grandfather, denies to another the enjoyment of his natural rights. I did not like Hitler and I do not like Faubus. Nor should I have liked Hitler any the more had someone told me that the reason he cremated Jews was that his grandfather had been badly treated by a Jew. Mr. Marshall's simplified interpretation of history, even were it acceptable as history, would only explain how segregationists, at least the Southern variety, got that way. It would not furnish them with a moral justification for staying that way nor impose upon the rest of us a moral obligation to respect that way at a cost to millions of our Negro brothers of the denial of their fundamental human rights.

No comment is called for by most of the emotionally charged remarks of Mr. Marshall, who oddly enough deplores "playing upon the emotions of people." He should, however, be severely rebuked for suggesting any similarity, let alone a parallel, between a murderer like Nat Turner and a singularly effective champion of "understanding and moderation" like Dr. Martin Luther King. *(Rev.)* GEORGE H. DUNNE, S.J.

III—Literature and Morality

New York, N. Y.

TO THE EDITORS: In "Literature and Morality" [Feb. 27] it seems to me that Richard Horchler has spotlighted the most serious problems attending the moral criticism of literature without slighting the complexities of the issue. Still, I think that especially toward the end of the article he has been rather too hard on the "moralist" and too ready to believe the best of the artist. He reminds us that the "moralist" (a word which in common parlance has the pejorative connotation of a moral rigorist who deliberately neglects art in his judgments; "critic with moral sense" would have been a happier phrase) is after all dealing with contingent and clouded issues, while the artist is one who works for "disinterested contemplation, the celebration of truth, the expression of wonder before the beauty and mystery of human life." One is tempted to say that if that were the case there would be no tension between the artist and the critic with moral sense. The world being as it is, that is far from the case.

Here it is instructive to look at Philip Hartung's review of a recent movie in the same issue. The exalted themes of the artist are not noticeably apparent in this movie, in which, "when the pregnant wife and her insanely jealous husband are in a serious automobile accident, she loses her unborn child and the husband becomes sterile," and in which the rest of the plot deals with her hopes for artificial insemination. Wherefore Mr. Hartung, who seems to be a responsible critic, concludes, "the script dwells not on the real moral issue involved but on the confused characters whose home life could hardly be described as healthy for

CALASANCTIUS PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Boys accepted after completion of 3rd, 4th, or 5th Grade. Course leads to advanced college placement. I.Q. of 140 or over required. Maximum development of ability and personality encouraged. Broad curriculum.

Inquire: **Headmaster, 120 Rumsey Rd. Buffalo 9, N. Y.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adults, let alone children." Are the "moral issues involved" here that difficult to discern? If so, then the artist himself is condemned to confused and confusing work. This is a lesson about the artist's relation to the values of the community in which he works.

What the "moralist" has to say may be of great help to the artist. In literature especially, where the artist cannot neglect verbal meaning, it would seem that he can neglect the moral implications of his words only at the expense of richness or of human relevance. That neglect has become the rule in much of contemporary literature. As it is, intelligent criticism involving value-judgments would be a positive tonic to the writing of our time which is so unreadable, even though it is read. However, I am afraid that the first need is, before an examination of good and evil, a cheap edition of a good grammar.

Mr. Horchler has done a service in scoring against the "moralistic critic" who, having no awareness of the complexities of literary meaning, has no business judging the moral content of that meaning. But I think he has not considered the need for moralists who are educated in the arts to raise the standards of literature by helping to create in turn an audience with high standards. Now, the critics prefer to keep their jobs by maintaining a discreet silence on the human values of literature. But there never was an enduring culture that did not have a quick attention to the moral worth of its writing. It is simply another sign of our declining literacy that the public shrinks from questioning novels and plays in this way. Indeed, to the discredit of the artist, they are getting more and more of what they want in literature.

Plato was not easy with the poets of his own day, but he knew what he was about in his censure. It was for the love of good art that he was demanding, for he himself was a poet and a dramatist of sorts. In Book Two of the *Laws* he has a word for the critics of today: "The ancient and common custom of Hellas—did certainly leave the judgment (of the plays) to the body of spectators, who determined the victor by a show of hands. But this custom has been the destruction of the poets; for they now are in the habit of composing with a view to please the bad taste of their judges,—and also it has been the ruin of the theater; they ought to be having characters put before them better than their own, but now by their own act the opposite result follows."

To insist upon moral evaluation from our critics is strong medicine, but the malady threatens the very roots of our society. Here again we are able to profit from Plato's advice: "And therefore the judges must be men of character, for they will require both wisdom and courage." What better place for the informed Christian to take the lead? The work is providentially assigned to him; for without knowing it, Plato has called down upon the critic two of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost.

WALTER E. ARNOLD, JR.,

REPLY

MR. ARNOLD and I have no quarrel. He emphasizes the "need for moralists who are educated in the arts to raise the standards of literature by helping to create in turn an audience with high standards." I agree with him about this need, and said as much in the article. If I did not dwell on this point, it was because my article was concerned chiefly with the understanding—and misunderstanding—evident in too many moralistic judgments made today.

I do not, however, think that "critic with a moral sense" is really a fair equivalent to "moralist," although it is undeniably "a happier phrase." "Intelligent criticism involving value-judgments," which Mr. Arnold desires, is not what I deplored. "Unfortunately," I said, "as we encounter the moralistic judgment of literature today, it seems often to have been made with no awareness of the complexities involved, little appreciation of literature's function, scant knowledge of its techniques."

Mr. Arnold was kind enough to say that my article "spotlighted the most serious problems." This is all it attempted.

RICHARD HORCHLER.

NOW AVAILABLE at leading book stores

CROSS CURRENTS VOL. 8, Bound $5

—contains the 1958 contents of this quarterly review, including: (Individual reprints also available @ 25¢, 5 for $1; 5 free to new subscribers ($3.50 a year)

☐ **ORAISON:** Psychoanalyst & Confessor; ☐ **PRICE** on Dewey; ☐ **O'BRIEN:** Annual Review of Theology; ☐ **COLLINS:** Annual Review of Philosophy; ☐ **BENOIT** on the Eucharist; ☐ **DUBARLE:** Original Sin in Genesis; ☐ **ONG:** Oral & Objective Correlatives; ☐ **MONCHANIN:** India & Contemplation; ☐ **MARCEL:** The Lantern (a play); ☐ **CASSERLEY:** Image & Event-Symbols; ☐ **DELOS** on Modern War; ☐ **BUZZARD:** Limiting War; ☐ **ARENDT:** Totalitarian Imperialism; ☐ **JOHNSON:** Public Education & Religion; ☐ **FRANSEN:** Psychology of Grace; ☐ **ANTONELLI** on Obedience; ☐ **BRUNNER:** An International Ethos; ☐ **BUBER:** Guilt & Guilt-Feelings; ☐ **LEONARD:** The Christian & the Non-Christian; ☐ **MOELLER** on Camus; ☐ **MARTINEZ:** St. Thomas in Catholic Philosophy; ☐ **LUDMANN:** Movies & Evangelization; ☐ **LORIMER:** Ethics & Population.

CROSS CURRENTS, West Nyack, N.Y.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

☐ Send Vol. 8 (1958) bound, @ $5.
☐ Enter my subscription for 1959 ($3.50)
☐ Send reprints checked above.
☐ Check enclosed ☐ Bill me

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mankind on the March Toward Unity

THE MOVEMENT OF WORLD REVOLUTION. By Christopher Dawson. Sheed & Ward. $3.

By FRANCIS E. McMAHON

IT IS SYMPTOMATIC of the times that no one will be startled by the title of this slim but important work. The fact of radical change on a cosmic scale is only too patent to everybody. But questions do arise about the nature of the change, its *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem*. It is good to have Christopher Dawson turn his attention to these momentous problems. He has plumbed the cultural depths of the past with unusual insight, and has explored the field of metahistory. Thus he has rare qualifications for the analysis of the contemporary scene in terms of the historical dimensions.

The revolution of which he speaks is the impact of that complex "entity" called Western culture upon the rest of the world, an impact productive both of good and of evil. What the final result will be no one knows. It is quite clear that there is not as yet one world in the Augustinian sense of "a people bound together by a common agreement as to the objects of their love." Culturally and religiously, there are still many loves, and therefore many worlds and many peoples. But Mr. Dawson's point is that the masses of mankind are *moving towards* a kind of unity, and that the chief agent in the process has been the dynamic heritage of European civilization.

To a degree without equal in the history of the race, the European man for centuries has been "on the march." He has left his imprint upon every part of the globe. He explored strange highways of the sea, and opened up new continents. The lure of material wealth prompted many of his treks, but he was often impelled likewise by the desire to spread Christ's Gospel. Perhaps most frequently, he was spurred on by a combination of base and noble objectives. Plain curiosity was not absent—the new and the unexplored were sought out for their own sakes. And in accounting for the restless spirit of the man of Europe, Dawson does not ignore the biological factors—population pressures and the quest for food. The result today of all this is a world in revolution. For wherever the man of Europe went, he carried in his pack the seeds of profound transformation.

Throughout the long period of exploring, of proselytizing, of colonizing, Europe itself was undergoing radical changes in its spiritual character. As a culture, says Dawson, Europe was never as well-knit as other historic cultures. In his *The Making of Europe* he described at length the ingredients—especially Christianity and humanism—that had entered into its formation. As the centuries passed, Europe was subjected to a number of cultural upheavals. The Renaissance and the Reformation brought down in ruins the mediaeval religious synthesis, and the Enlightenment immeasurably strengthened the waves of secularism. The author calls attention to the influence of such figures as Luther and Calvin, Descartes and Rousseau—men who helped to father the modern world, but who, as progenitors, unquestionably would have been surprised at some of their offspring.

It is a secularized West that is altering the face of the globe. The non-European peoples are absorbing as rapidly as they can the lessons they have learned about science and technology, and about democracy and popular education. For the first time also they are learning the meaning of nationalism—and putting it into practice. The terrain is disputed everywhere by another Western ideology—Communism. In fact, the non-Europeans are taking everything they can from the West except Christian wisdom. And this is the paradox: while adopting the political and social ideologies and techniques of the West, they are at the same time rebelling against the teacher and former master. They are seeking to acquire "the whole apparatus of Western culture in order to shake off their material dependence on the West and to take part on equal terms in the social and intellectual life of the modern world."

Can the secularized tools now forging the unity of mankind insure a genuine and enduring world order? Those familiar with the earlier writings of Dawson will know that his answer is a definite negative. He believes, for example, that an unbridled nationalism is a destructive force which could lead to a resurgence of a blood-and-race type of totalitarianism in many parts of the world. The religious and cultural traditions of the East may prove to be no match for the new forces emerging, precisely because these traditions are being abandoned by the promoters of Western ideology in their own lands. The new leaders are turning their backs upon their own past.

Here is at once a challenge and an opportunity for the Christian Church, Dawson believes. Humanity may be entering a long and terrible night, but Christians cannot despair. For they believe "that the hand of God is at work in history and that the great revolution of world cultures that is taking place before our eyes is the instrument of divine purpose." The task of Christians is to fill the spiritual vacuum. The difficulties facing them are formidable, not the least of which is the tendency of many non-Westerners to equate the Christian Faith with Western culture. In truth, however, "it is the nature of Christianity to transcend culture as it transcends nationality." Dawson believes that the most important media for the spread of Christian influence in the East may be found in such great urban centers like Calcutta and Bombay, Tokyo and Singapore. The early Christians began their work in the metropolitan centers of the ancient world, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were inhabited by those most bereft of spiritual vision. The large cities of the Orient may be, in their turn, the Romes, Antiochs and Corinths of tomorrow.

Three of Christendom's greatest thinkers, Maritain, Gilson and Dawson have in recent years given their attention to the problems of world order. Maritain developed the theme in his *Man and the State* as well as in *L'Église Catholique et les Civilisations*. Gilson wrote his significant *Les Métamorphoses de la Cité de Dieu*. Ranking now with these studies is the present work of Dawson.

They are, all three of them, profound studies, and indispensable to the student of world problems. Although all three men approach the matter from wholly distinct viewpoints, they converge in the same conclusion about the vital role of religious faith in bringing about an effective unity of mankind. Technical studies about world organization have their place, but these thinkers demonstrate that to ignore the role of transcendent principle is to engage merely in shadow-boxing.

A Man's Vision

PILOT PROJECT, INDIA. By Albert Mayer and associates, in collaboration with McKim Marriott and Richard L. Park. University of California Press. $5.50.

By RICHARD V. CARPENTER

IN THE COURSE of his wartime service in India with the U.S. Army of Engineers, Albert Mayer had occasion to visit Prime Minister Nehru and discuss with him at length the problems of village improvement. In 1946, Nehru invited Mayer to come to India and try some of the things which they had talked about, and during the ensuing ten years Mayer divided his time between India and his architectural practice in New York City.

Mayer was official adviser in the pilot project for the rural development of Etawah District in Uttar Pradesh, the prototype of similar projects in India which from 1948 to 1952 had expanded to five, and by 1957 to 1,480. In *Pilot Project, India,* an anthropologist from the University of California and a political scientist from the University of Chicago have collaborated in compiling an invaluable case study of Mayer's experience. The book contains, among other things, accounts which Mayer wrote periodically to friends in the United States, narrating particular progress and, more important, expounding and illustrating his philosophy of subsidiarity and participation—or, as he puts it, the theory of "inner administrative democracy."

Under India's earlier program for village improvement, Mayer found, staffs of experts advised the district government in such specialized areas as agriculture, engineering, education, health and the like. The district government, in turn, acted at its discretion on sub-district and village levels through regular police and other channels. Mayer cites typical failures of this authoritarian approach: "brick roads which had gone to pieces for lack of maintenance, public latrines that had never been used, house ventilators that had been installed under some official's pressure and promptly filled up as soon as that official left."

In contrast to this system, Mayer sought to decentralize planning so that "initiative should come from the bottom up, from the field in." His target was "to help the villager help himself, to develop his resourcefulness and confidence to meet other problems." Concrete projects for improvement of different villages—for example, a new pond or water supply in one place, improved seeds or fertilizing in another, road repairs in another—were initiated in meetings at the respective villages. And the decision in each case depended on the expressed needs and desires of the villagers themselves. Responsibility was vested in a village-level worker who generally was selected on the basis of interest and natural leadership evidenced at these first meetings. A title and small stipend gave this village-level leader both status and incentive. The line of responsibility and communication ran directly and continuously from him to the technological staffs at higher levels, bypassing the traditional police and revenue branches of government.

In carrying out the new plan of organization, its proponents faced the great practical problems of selecting and training supervisory personnel and of educating and stimulating the villagers out of an apathetic fatalism. Study camps and discussion groups were organized for leading members of cooperative societies and village councils. Their programs included such things as agricultural demonstrations in the fields; training in simple public health measures; demonstrating the value and methods of group discussion and the importance of following up any projects initiated. Mayer concedes there was much backsliding. But there were also many successes which the force of example began to multiply.

Mayer gives credit to the dedicated example of Gandhian "constructive workers" and to missionaries for their earlier rural work. He cites as handicaps of the latter the failure of the villagers to identify with them, and the missionaries' aloofness—perhaps out of necessity—from government at local and state levels. On the latter point Mayer comments: "In a country where government is pervasive, and where as yet for many items of credit and supply there are few sure channels but those of government, effective rural development work seemed to demand close operational acquaintance and friendliness with government."

The book's make-up, of contemporaneous reports and correspondence from various sources, sometimes exasperates by reason of repetition and disorganization. The compensation, however, is the impression it creates of immediacy and authenticity. And its unity is provided by Mayer's dedication to the principle of subsidiarity.

The importance of this book lies in its numerous and perceptive case studies, which illustrate the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successful operation of subsidiarity in so unpromising a field as India. One note of caution must be sounded, however. The operation of subsidiarity—Mayer's "inner administrative democracy"—must depend on the quality of the men involved. The pilot project reported in this book was manned by personnel flushed with experimental zeal, and one may reasonably surmise that as the program expands and projects multiply the reforming spirit will lag. Nor, I suspect, are there many leaders available either here or in India with the combination of good will, intelligence and strong personality possessed by Albert Mayer. But if the program does not always and everywhere succeed, it will hardly be the fault of the blue print so dramatically outlined in this book.

Exhaustive Study

EVELYN WAUGH: PORTRAIT OF AN ARTIST. By Frederick J. Stopp. Little, Brown. $4.

By EDWIN KENNEBECK

IT MAY SEEM a little surprising to find a whole book devoted to Evelyn Waugh; for all his virtuosity and sophistication, his writings do not command much special critical attention. Though Waugh himself has been firmly reticent about his personal affairs despite the very definite, inimitable public image he has presented since his early days, his novels, most of them harsh and hard and funny, do not seem to "conceal" a great deal—except the labor of production. This book by Dr. Stopp, of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, is neither an exposé of Waugh's private life nor a study of the artist's struggle to work his sentences and chapters into successful novels. And it is not an analysis of practical techniques in his fiction. It is mainly a thematic interpretation of the novels and their relation to the mind of the writer.

To hold a novel "steady and motionless before us" is, as Percy Lubbock pointed out thirty-five years ago, not possible as it is with a painting or a sculpture. Mr. Lubbock perhaps exaggerated the difficulties of really seeing a novel entire, as indeed is proved by his own explications in *The Craft of Fiction.* Still, except in the presence of truly creative essayists, when we read *about* novels we feel a kind of restlessness which doubtless arises from this separation between book and commentator. Dr. Stopp has undertaken the job of grasping these evasive forms partly by relating the novels to Waugh himself, partly by tracing the development of themes within the several works and in the total *oeuvre,* and partly by describing Waugh's use of various modes or attitudes—myth, comedy, innocence, hallucination, and the like.

"The Writer," "The Novels," "The Artist"—so the book divides its problems: how to do a biography that is interesting although not really very personal; how to write about the novels fully without simply giving synopses; how to comment on the writer's art without repeating what has already been said, and how to hit a balance between close reading of the texts and general delineation of themes. Dr. Stopp has been variously successful with each problem. On the one hand we may say that our judgment of his success depends on how much we admire Waugh in the first place. On the other hand we ought to be able to tell whether Dr. Stopp has shown reasons for admiring him more—which is his obvious intention. For the most part, he has. The reader who may have been only generally aware of Waugh's care and virtuosity can get, under Dr. Stopp's guidance, a much more detailed idea of how they work.

Dr. Stopp seems to know the novels backward and forward; as a result we have the advantage of seeing them as if they were somehow gathered together, lined up side by side, cross-referenced. We learn they may, after all, contain things that are concealed from the brief gaze of the Common Reader. Dr. Stopp shows, for example, how the characters of Anthony Blanche and the young Sebastian Flyte, in *Brideshead Revisited,* together define and set off the central character of Charles Ryder and influence the structure of the story. He points out that "All Mr. Waugh's heroes are addicted to fantasy; all of them are forced out into the open and made to face the consequences of their fantasy being taken seriously." He even manages to see *The Loved One* as Waugh's act of "expiation" for the sentimental indulgences of *Brideshead Revisited:* "In Aimée, a creature of religious mania out of alcoholism, [Waugh] consigned the world of Julia Marchmain and Sebastian Flyte to the furnaces of the Happier Hunting Ground."

And so there comes a point where we begin to wonder how far a critic need go in his search for intricate contrasts and parallels. "Consider," writes Dr. Stopp, "how Helena [in the novel of that name] so completely provides an answer to the most resounding and grim failure of the Innocent in the earlier work, *A Handful of Dust.* Both central figures seek in marriage some new and better allegiance to a home . . . ; both are betrayed. Each then continues the quest . . . in another mode, Tony in his despairing archaeological expedition to the jungles of Brazil, Helena in the pursuance of her . . . desire to excavate the City of Troy. . . . Mr. Waugh's sacred and profane mem-

THE THEATRE GUILD and DORE SCHARY present
RALPH BELLAMY
SUNRISE AT CAMPOBELLO
by DORE SCHARY
with MARY FICKETT · HENRY JONES
Directed by VINCENT J. DONEHUE
CORT THEA. 138 W. 48 St., N. Y. C.

Third Annual
Study Week on the Lay Apostolate
August 23-28
All facilities for men and women on campus.
Room, meals, tuition — $30.00
Write for program: Rev. J. F. X. Erhart, S.J.
ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE
Philadelphia 31, Pa.

LA SALLE
Military Academy
Foremost Catholic military preparatory school under Christian Brothers. Accredited college preparation. Grades 9-12. Small classes. ROTC highest rating. Beautiful 160-acre campus on Great South Bay. 76th year.
Write for Catalog.
Box W, Oakdale, L.I., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

St. Francis College
Brooklyn, N.Y.
MORNING—AFTERNOON—
EVENING SESSIONS
for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts
Bachelor of Science
Bachelor of Business
Administration
BORO HALL CENTER
16 Court Street
Brooklyn 1, N.Y.
FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:
Director of Admissions
35 Butler Street
Brooklyn 31, New York
TRiangle 5-1210

Real Sisters but in Modern Dress

Win souls for Christ through . . .
Social Work * Catechetical Work * Medical Work
Mission Sisters of the Holy Ghost
1030 N. River Rd. Saginaw, Mich.

Coming Special Issues
May 8: SPRING BOOKS
May 22: SPRING JUVENILES

Classified

• RATES: $1 a line, or 6 words, 2-line minimum. Discounts: 3 times, 5%; 7 times, 10%; 13 times, 15%. Payable in advance. DISPLAY: $10.78 per inch, same discounts.

Irish Books and Gifts

• Books, Linens, Gifts, Catalogs. IRISH INDUSTRIES DEPOT, INC. 870 Lexington Ave., (near 65th) New York

Catholic Books

• CATHOLIC BOOKS, NEW and USED Free Lists, Free Search Service C. F. PETELLE, Box 289, Maywood, Illinois

Handmade Wedding Bands

• HANDMADE LITURGICAL WEDDING BANDS. Renerd A. Koehnemann, P.O. Box 575. Chesterton, Indiana.

Position Wanted

• WOMAN, 23, B.A., Catholic, desires job in Russia. BOX 424, THE COMMONWEAL.

Commission Wanted

• SPAIN in May, superior connections. Will consider commission or agency. J. F. BYRNE, 1417 E. 60, Chicago 37.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

SUBSCRIBERS are requested to return the address portion from a Commonweal wrapper showing the subscriber's current address, in sending in a new address. Be sure to include zone number in new address. Allow three weeks for change to take affect.

ories are so consistent and interwoven that the profane imaginative pattern is succeeded, after fifteen years, by its sacred counterpart in the way in which type answers to anti-type in the Christian, typological view of the continuity of history. Tony Last's expulsion from Hetton and his end in Brazil is the fall of the old Adam—*o felix culpa!*—redeemed, in time, by the action of Helena. . . ."

Altogether, Dr. Stopp's is a thorough and loving book; and both love and thoroughness have their disadvantages at times. His style is that of a man who takes for granted the reader's interest in the subject. Though he is capable of admitting several failures on Waugh's part, Dr. Stopp often takes an over-indulgent tone; in a book of this sort we do not require such a comment about Waugh's proposed biography of Monsignor Ronald Knox as "There is every reason to believe that the combination of author and subject will lead to an outstanding literary work of our time." There are occasional disconcerting inaccuracies—as when Graham Greene's novel is called *The Unquiet American.* There are, mingled with a concise manner, some grammatically imprecise passages, and some overly detailed ones.

Dr. Stopp's very intensity can be a disservice, especially to the early Waugh novels; if you are led to think too much about a novel like *A Handful of Dust* you begin to ask questions that Waugh's own crafty technique aims to exclude. Also, detailed expositions of novels that one has not read become tiresome, no matter how reverently Dr. Stopp reveals their symbolical or psychological significance.

REVIEWERS

Francis E. McMahon, author of *A Catholic Looks at the World*, is a regular contributor.

Richard V. Carpenter is Professor of Law at Loyola University, Chicago. This is his first appearance in The Commonweal.

Edwin Kennebeck, a regular reviewer, is on the editorial staff of a leading New York publishing house.

Educational

KANSAS

St. Benedict's College

Atchison, Kansas. A Catholic College for men conducted by the Benedictine Fathers. A Liberal Arts College, accredited by the North Central Association. Located fifty miles northwest of Kansas City, Missouri, on the Missouri River. Address Registrar for information.

MAINE

St. Francis College

Conducted by the Franciscan Fathers. Small 4-year liberal arts college for men. B.A. degree. Majors in 5 fields. Organized sports: basketball, soccer, baseball, tennis; swimming, boating on Maine Coast. Two hours from Boston. Tuition, board and room: $1215. Catalog. Director of Admissions, 592 Pool St., Biddeford, Maine.

INDIANA

Saint Mary's College Notre Dame

Graduate School of Sacred Theology For Sisters and Laywomen. Distinguished faculty of Religious and Lay Professors. Saint Mary's College, Box 11, Notre Dame, Indiana.

NEW JERSEY

Georgian Court College

Four-year course leading to B.A. and B.S. degree provides a solid background of general culture and special training in one particular field. Well-integrated program in Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, Science, Music, Home Economics, Business Administration, Teacher Training. Fully accredited. Address Secretary, Lakewood, N.J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INFLATION...just an Indian Giver

Not only is inflation an "Indian giver"—he's a pickpocket to boot.

Under inflation you think you get a few more dollars in pay. But then you go to spend them. Now you find that inflation has already *taken back* those dollars!

Inflation is caused by a lot of things. But one of the most important is rising labor costs without a substantial increase in the nation's productive efficiency. The reason: 75 percent or more of the final cost of what you buy goes for labor.

It's kind of a chain reaction. With each round of wage and price increases, your dollars lose another chunk of purchasing power.

If things keep on this way another twenty years—or ten—or five—what will happen to your savings, your insurance, your pension plans, your children's education?

Isn't it time to stop this spiral of inflation that eventually robs you of your future security?

This message is being brought to you by

REPUBLIC STEEL

as a member of the

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE

Republic Steel makes many products which are sold directly to the public, besides the thousands of tons of steel that go into other industries for additional fabricating. Among the consumer goods are Truscon Metal Windows, Steel Doors, and Sliding Closet Doors; Republic Steel Kitchens; gutters and downspouts; metal lath; bolts, nuts, and nails.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED